



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Cognitive-behavioural longitudinal assessment in ALS

Citation for published version:

Poletti, B, Solca, F, Carelli, L, Faini, A, Madotto, F, Lafronza, A, Monti, A, Zago, S, Ciammola, A, Ratti, A, Ticozzi, N, Abrahams, S & Silani, V 2018, 'Cognitive-behavioural longitudinal assessment in ALS: The Italian Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural ALS Screen (ECAS)', *Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal Degeneration*, vol. 19, no. 5-6, pp. 387-395.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21678421.2018.1473443>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1080/21678421.2018.1473443](https://doi.org/10.1080/21678421.2018.1473443)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal Degeneration

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal Degeneration on 26/05/2018, available online:
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21678421.2018.1473443>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Cognitive-behavioural longitudinal assessment in ALS: the Italian Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural ALS Screen (ECAS)

BARBARA POLETTI¹, FEDERICA SOLCA², LAURA CARELLI¹, ANDREA FAINI³, FABIANA
MADOTTO⁴, ANNALISA LAFRONZA¹, ALESSIA MONTI⁵, STEFANO ZAGO⁶, ANDREA
CIAMMOLA¹, ANTONIA RATTI^{1,2}, NICOLA TICOZZI^{1,2}, SHARON ABRAHAMS^{7&}, VINCENZO
SILANI^{1,2&}

¹Department of Neurology and Laboratory of Neuroscience - IRCCS Istituto Auxologico Italiano, Piazzale
Brescia, 20 - 20149 Milan, Italy
b.poletti@auxologico.it
Tel. (+39) 02 61911.2609
l.carelli@auxologico.it
Tel. (+39) 02 61911.2609
annalisa.lafronza@gmail.com
Tel. (+39) 02 61911.2609
a.ciammola@auxologico.it
Tel. (+39) 02 61911.2617
vincenzo@silani.com
Tel. (+39) 02 61911.2982

²Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, “Dino Ferrari” Center, Università degli Studi di Milano,
Via F. Sforza, 35 - 20122 Milan, Italy
federica.solca@unimi.it
Tel. (+39) 02 61911.2609
antonio.ratti@unimi.it
Tel. (+39) 02 61911.3045
nicola.ticozzi@unimi.it
Tel. (+39) 02 61911.2617

³Department of Cardiovascular, Neural and Metabolic Sciences - IRCCS Istituto Auxologico Italiano, Piazzale
Brescia, 20 - 20149 Milan, Italy
a.faini@auxologico.it
Tel. (+39) 02 61911.2928

⁴Research Centre on Public Health, Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Milano-Bicocca, Via
Cadore, 48 - 20900 Monza, Italy.
fabiana.madotto@unimib.it
Tel. (+39) 039 233.2681

⁵Department of Neurorehabilitation Sciences, Casa Cura Policlinico (CCP), Via Dezza 48 - 20144 Milan, Italy
alessia.monti@unitn.it
Tel. (+39) 02 48593199

⁶Department of Neuroscience and Mental Health, Università degli Studi di Milano, IRCCS Ospedale Maggiore
Policlinico, Via Francesco Sforza, 35 - 20122 Milan, Italy
stefano.zago@unimi.it
Tel. (+39) 02 55033854

⁷Euan MacDonald Centre for Motor Neurone Disease Research, Human Cognitive Neuroscience-Psychology,
PPLS, Psychology Department, University of Edinburgh, 7 George Square - EH8 9JZ – Edinburgh, UK
s.abrahams@ed.ac.uk
Tel. (+44) 0131 6503339

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work

[&]These authors also contributed equally to this work

Running title: ECAS longitudinal assessment in ALS

Corresponding author:
Barbara Poletti, PhD
Department of Neurology and Laboratory of Neuroscience
IRCCS Istituto Auxologico Italiano
Piazzale Brescia, 20 - 20149 - Milan, Italy
Phone: +39 02 619112609
Fax: +39 02 619112937
e-mail: b.poletti@auxologico.it

Abstract

Objective: The study presents data on the longitudinal administration of the Italian Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural ALS Screen (ECAS). We investigated cognitive-behavioural performance in a group of ALS patients over time and the feasibility of repeating the ECAS longitudinally compared to standard neuropsychological tests. Finally, correlations between clinical/genetic and cognitive/behavioural data were considered.

Methods: 168 ALS patients were tested at baseline (T_0). Among these, 48 patients performed the ECAS after 6 months (T_1), 18 patients performed it at T_2 (12 months) and 5 patients were assessed after 24 months (T_3). Participants were also administered two cognitive test (FAB; MoCA) and psychological questionnaires (BDI; STAI/Y). The FBI was carried out with caregivers.

Results: No cognitive deterioration was found across follow-ups. In contrast, although scores did not change between T_0 and T_1 , scores improved significantly for ECAS Total/ALS Non-specific and Memory domains when the ECAS was repeated on three occasions (T_0 , T_1 , T_2). Apathy/Inertia was the most common behavioural symptom, but no worsening of behavioural scores was detected over time. After 12–24 months, patients were still able to perform the ECAS in total, in contrast to FAB and MoCA, which were only partially administrable.

Conclusions: The significant improvement of some ECAS scores over time supports the presence of possible practice effects, particularly in the memory domain, highlighting the need to accommodate for these in longitudinal assessments, through healthy controls groups or alternate versions. This work represents the first Italian ECAS follow-up study and confirms ECAS feasibility in patients with increasing physical disability.

Keywords: *ECAS; longitudinal assessment; Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS); cognition; behavioural change; practice effect*

1 **Introduction**

2 Cognitive-behavioural changes in patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) are now
3 fully recognized as integral elements of the disease, along a spectrum of frontotemporal
4 dysfunctions (1, 2). In recent years, several cognitive screening tools have been developed for
5 ALS (3-8); however, they are not designed to detect a heterogeneous cognitive involvement
6 (9-11), nor to compensate for patients' physical disability (6, 12, 13). In order to overcome
7 such limitations, Abrahams et al. (14) developed a rapid cognitive-behavioural screening tool
8 (Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural ALS Screen – ECAS), specifically designed to
9 accommodate for verbal/motor disability. The ECAS has been translated (15, 16, 17) and
10 validated against gold standard neuropsychological measures (15, 16, 18-20), showing high
11 sensitivity and specificity (15, 18).

12 Although the existence of cognitive-behavioural involvement in ALS is now well-established,
13 its longitudinal evolution has been less investigated. Previous follow-up studies revealed
14 conflicting results (21-29); however, due to the lack of verbal-motor adaptations, it is not
15 possible to determine whether any observed deterioration was caused by increasing physical
16 disability affecting performance or by cognitive decline. Similarly, few longitudinal studies
17 are available on behavioural changes along the disease course (30-32). To date, only one
18 study has focused on longitudinal assessment using the ECAS, specifically investigating a
19 possible learning effect on ECAS repeated measurements (33); however, no data were
20 provided about the relationship between cognitive and clinical aspects, including affective or
21 genetic issues. Moreover, the longitudinal validity of the ECAS Behaviour Interview, also
22 with respect to other standard tools, was not considered. The possible progression of
23 cognitive-behavioural alterations over time represents a crucial issue, since such changes are a
24 negative prognostic factor in ALS (34), associated with shorter survival and faster functional
25 decline (24, 35, 36). This study aimed 1) to investigate cognitive-behavioural change in ALS

patients longitudinally; 2) to compare the feasibility of undertaking an ECAS over time against standard neuropsychological assessment tools; 3) to analyse the relationship between cognitive, behavioural and psychological aspects and clinical/genetic features.

Material and methods

Participants and procedure

168 ALS patients, who fulfilled the revised El Escorial criteria for possible, probable, probable laboratory-supported or definite ALS (37), were recruited at the Department of Neurology, IRCCS Istituto Auxologico Italiano between May 2013 and February 2017. Patients in terminal stage of disease or with major comorbid medical, neurological, psychiatric or cardio-vascular diseases were excluded. Disease status was evaluated using the ALS Functional Rating Scale-Revised - ALSFRS-R (38). Patients were also screened for mutations in *C9orf72*, *SOD1*, *TARDBP* and *FUS* genes according to standard protocols (39, 40). A subset of patients (N=107) was previously included in the Italian ECAS validation study (15).

All patients were invited to take part in a longitudinal study from baseline (T₀), with follow-up at 6 (T₁), 12 (T₂) and 24 (T₃) months when possible given the clinical conditions. Of the 168 patients who performed the ECAS protocol at T₀, 48 patients performed it at T₁, while 18 patients performed it also at T₂. Finally, 5 patients were tested at T₃; however, due to the small proportion of patients who managed to complete this 24-months follow-up, such data were not considered, due to their poor reliability. Further details are reported in Figure 1. Given the rate of attrition, the longitudinal comparison was conducted in the 48 patients who performed the ECAS at T₀ and T₁ and in the 18 patients who performed all the three assessment at T₀, T₁ and T₂.

The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of our Institution (N° of approval: 2013_06_25) and all eligible subjects received both verbal and written information about the study. All participants signed an informed consent, according to the Declaration of Helsinki.

Cognitive and Psychological Assessment

The Italian version of the ECAS was administered (15), assessing different cognitive domains, including ALS-Specific and ALS Non-specific tasks. When possible, the mode of testing (spoken or written) was maintained for the longitudinal screens. Moreover, caregivers longitudinally performed the ECAS Behaviour Interview (see Poletti et al. (15) for further details about the procedure adopted); both the number of behavioural symptoms (ECAS Behaviour Interview-Symptoms) and the global score obtained (ECAS Behaviour Interview-Total score) were recorded.

The study protocol also included two widely used screening tools, i.e. the Frontal Assessment Battery (FAB) (41) and the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) (42), that were administered at T₀ and at any follow-up, when possible, and the Frontal Behavioural Inventory (FBI), assessing behavioural alterations (43). To explore the relationship between ECAS performance and psychological factors, participants completed the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) (44) and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-Y (STAI-Y) (45), for depressive and anxiety evaluation, respectively.

Statistical analyses

To compare the scores between the longitudinal follow-ups, ANOVA for repeated measures were used followed by a posteriori contrasts when applicable. Otherwise the comparison was performed using Friedman's test followed by Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity

correction; for discrete variables McNemar test was applied. Benjamini and Hochberg False Discovery Rate was used as correction for multiple testing. Finally, Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to assess the degree of association between measures. An α level of 0.05 was considered for all hypothesis tests. All data analyses were performed using SAS 9.2 software (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

Results

Patients' demographic characteristics and reasons for attrition are depicted in Figure 1. Performance of 168 patients at T₀, 48 patients at T₁ and 18 patients at T₂ are summarized in Supplementary Table 1.

Nine out of 168 patients (5%) had to use the written version at T₀ due to severe dysarthria and five out of the 48 patients who completed the T₁ evaluation (10%) had to switch to the written version at 6-months follow-up. The proportion of ALS patients for which it was necessary to change to the written version did not increase at 12- and 24-months follow-ups. The cognitive-behavioural performance in the ECAS of patients within the local geographical region who dropped out was analysed (see Supplementary Table 2 for details); results revealed that 38% of them presented with behavioural alterations and met the new revised criteria for ALS with behavioural impairment (ALSbi) (46) basing on ECAS performance at their last evaluation, while 32% could be classified for ALS with cognitive impairment (ALSci) and 13% as ALS with combined cognitive and behavioural impairment (ALScbi).

Longitudinal ECAS in ALS patients

No statistically significant difference was found between any ECAS score from T₀ to T₁ in the 48 patients who performed the ECAS after 6 months from baseline [Table 1 near here].

When considering the subgroup who performed all the three assessments at T₀, T₁ and T₂ (N=18), results from ANOVA demonstrated a significant increase in ECAS Total and ALS Non-specific scores among the three follow-ups; in particular, post-hoc analysis revealed a significant increase from T₀ to T₂ (ECAS Total: $p=0.058$; ALS Non-specific: $p=0.004$), as well as from T₁ to T₂ (ECAS Total: $p=0.027$; ALS Non-specific: $p=0.011$). Moreover, the score obtained at the Memory subdomain globally increased among the three assessments, in particular between T₀ and T₁ ($p=0.039$) and between T₀ and T₂ ($p=0.012$), with patients showing a significantly higher score at the Immediate Recall task globally among the three follow-ups and particularly between T₁ and T₂ ($p=0.029$) [Table 2 near here].

Of 168 patients, 37% met criteria for ALSci (46) at T₀ and 31% of 48 patients were classified as ALSci at T₁. No patients met criteria for ALS-FTD at any follow-up. When considering the 18 patients who performed all the three assessments, 6 (33%) met criteria for ALSci at T₀, 5 (28%) were classified as ALSci at T₁ and 6 (33%) at T₂. No significant difference was detected over time in the percentage of patients classified as ALSci.

Behavioural changes

At baseline and at T₁, the majority of patients showed no relevant behavioural impairment or dysfunction detected across only one behavioural domain at the ECAS Behaviour Interview. Between 40-50% of patients showed evidence of behavioural changes meeting criteria for ALSbi at T₀ (41%) and T₁ (50%), while 33% of patients was classified as ALSbi at T₂. Moreover, 12% of ALS patients was classified as ALScbi at T₀, 21% at T₁ and 22% at T₂. Apathy/Inertia was the most represented symptom (34% at T₀, 42% at T₁, 33% at T₂), followed by Loss of Sympathy/Empathy at T₀ and T₁, while at T₂ Loss of Sympathy/Empathy, Behavioural Disinhibition and Change in Eating Behaviour were equally recorded as the most frequent dysfunctions (11%) after Apathy/Inertia. Data about the

distribution of behavioural dysfunctions at the ECAS Behaviour Interview across each follow-up are reported in Figure 2. Five patients at T₀ (3%), three at T₁ (6%) and none at T₂ had psychotic features; in all cases the only reported symptom was suspiciousness.

When considering the subgroup who completed all the three assessments, no significant increase in behavioural symptoms was detected neither at the ECAS Behaviour Interview-Symptoms ($p=0.716$), nor at the global score obtained at the ECAS Behaviour Interview-Total Score ($p=0.065$).

Strong correlations were found between both the number of symptoms and the total score at the ECAS Behaviour Interview and FBI-A, FBI-B and FBI Total score at any follow-up [Table 3 near here].

In the 48 patients who performed the ECAS twice (i.e. after 6 months from baseline), a significant increase of FBI Total Score and FBI-A was detected between T₀ and T₁ (FBI Total: $p=0.036$; FBI-A: $p=0.056$). Concerning the subgroup that completed all the three assessments, a significant increase of FBI Total Score could be globally detected ($p=0.038$); in particular, higher scores were found at T₂ with respect to T₀, but which did not reach statistical significance ($p=0.075$).

Focusing on the relationship between behavioural alterations in the ECAS Behaviour Interview and cognitive performance, the ECAS Behaviour Interview-Symptoms negatively correlated with ECAS Total, ALS-Specific and ALS Non-Specific scores only at T₂ (see Table 4). On the contrary, no correlations were found between the ECAS Behavioural Interview-Total Score and the ECAS subscores nor at T₀, T₁ or T₂. With concern to the FBI, no significant correlations were found at T₀ and T₁ between FBI-A, FBI-B and FBI Total score and any ECAS cognitive subscore, while at T₂ significant negative correlations of FBI-A and FBI Total scores were found with the ECAS Total, ALS-Specific and ALS Non-specific scores [Table 4 near here].

Longitudinal FAB and MoCA assessment in ALS patients

All patients were able to complete the ECAS without any difficulties at T₁. Even after 12–24 months, the ECAS was still feasible as indicated by completion of the full test by all of the patients bar one who performed these assessments. In contrast, the FAB was administrable only in 71% of patients at T₁ and in 67% of patients at T₂. With the MoCA, only 69% of patients could perform it at T₁ and 72% of patients completed it at T₂. Patients showed neither a significant deterioration nor improvement in the FAB and MoCA scores at T₁ and T₂, when considering the patients' subgroup who completed all the three assessments.

Clinical and affective status

No significant correlations were found between ECAS scores and disease duration or ALSFRS-R scores at any follow-up. Similarly, no correlations were found between disease duration and the number of behavioural symptoms or the ECAS Behaviour Interview-Total score at the carer interview.

With concern to psychological aspects, of the 154 patients who completed the BDI at T₀, 100 (65%) showed scores indicative of clinically significant depression, ranging from mild-to-moderate (66%), moderate-to-severe (26%) and severe (8%). At T₁, 33 out of 47 patients (70%) showed some degree of depression, while at T₂ 11 out of 17 patients (65%) showed depressive symptoms. In the subgroup that completed all the three follow-ups, no significant differences were found between T₀, T₁ and T₂. Patients did not show clinically relevant state and trait anxiety levels neither at T₀, nor at T₁ and T₂; moreover, no significant differences concerning anxiety emerged across the serial follow-ups, when considering the patients' subgroup who completed all the three assessments.

Relationship to genetic profile

At T₀ three (19%) of the 16 patients presenting with *C9orf72* repeat expansions performed abnormally on the ECAS Total, ALS-Specific and ALS Non-specific functions scores, while two (12.5%) were impaired at the ECAS Total and ALS-Specific functions scores. The remaining eleven patients (69%) showed normal cognitive performances. Six of 16 *C9orf72* patients (37,5%) who performed the study at T₀ and one of the two patients who performed it at T₂ met criteria for ALSbi, while none of the five *C9orf72* patients who performed the ECAS at T₁ showed cognitive impairment. Moreover, six of 16 patients at T₀, two of 5 at T₁ and one of two at T₂ were classified as ALSbi, while three patients at T₀ and one at T₂ met criteria for ALSchi. None of the *C9orf72* patients showed psychotic abnormalities at any follow-up.

Discussion

Longitudinal neuropsychological studies of ALS are plagued by difficulties in assessing patients with progressive physical disability. The lack of use of cognitive tools accommodating for verbal-motor disability is one of the reason for the sparse and often conflicting data. Our work represents the first Italian longitudinal study assessing both cognitive and behavioural performance in ALS patients through the use of a multi-dimensional screening test able to compensate for verbal-motor disability. All patients bar one were able to complete the whole ECAS. In contrast, the FAB was not administrable in about 30% of patients at 6 and 12 months; comparable data were also obtained for the MoCA. Such findings are to be explained by the presence of subtasks involving motor and verbal skills and not accommodating for physical disability, thus confirming previous literature data (15, 33, 47).

Longitudinal cognitive changes

The Italian ALS population showed no significant changes in ECAS scores from baseline to 6-months follow-up. After 12 months, our patients' subgroup who performed all the three evaluations achieved a significant improvement in some scores (ECAS Total, ALS Non-specific and Memory subdomain), thus presenting a possible practice effect. In contrast, Burkhard et al. (33) did not find any practice effect in an ALS cohort, although this was found in healthy controls. Such conflicting results could be attributed to our larger sample size, rather than to other factors such as age, education or disease duration. Our results seem to support a well-known phenomenon in neuropsychological assessment underlining the presence of potential practice effects or initial unfamiliarity with test situation when patients are assessed repeatedly (48, 49); such an issue has been poorly investigated in ALS and few results are available (28). Recently, in order to overcome this issue, alternate forms of the ECAS have been developed (ECAS B and C) (50, 51). Repeated serial administration of the ECAS original version over a short time period produced improved scores for ALS-Specific, ALS Non-specific and ECAS Total scores, whereas such effects were not found when ECAS alternate versions were administered serially. The current study demonstrates that these practice effects can last over longer months, particularly in relation to the memory domain.

Longitudinal behavioural changes

No increase was observed in the number of behavioural symptoms detected at the ECAS Behaviour Interview, nor at the ECAS Behaviour Interview-Total Score within 12 months. In line with recent literature, Apathy/Inertia and Loss of Sympathy/Empathy were the more frequently observed changes (52, 53); furthermore, at 12 months also Behaviour Disinhibition and Change in Eating Behaviour became prominent in our cohort. Our data are partially in contrast with previous results indicating a slight progression of behavioural alterations at the

ECAS over time (33). However, when considering the FBI scores, an increment of behavioural dysfunction was longitudinally found, thus confirming the possible progression of behavioural features in ALS. Such contrasting data about the longitudinal changes detected at ECAS Behaviour Interview and FBI, as well as the relationship with cognitive performance at the ECAS, could be explained by the fact that, unlike the FBI, the ECAS Behaviour Interview has been designed to diagnose ALSbi and/or ALS-FTD and scores the presence/absence of a behavioural dysfunction, not measuring its severity. Behavioural dysfunction also emerged as a prominent feature characterising our dropped-out patients, thus highlighting the need to consider these symptoms in ALS patients' clinical management.

The lack of significant correlations of disease duration and ALSFRS-R with ECAS cognitive/behavioural performance is in line with previous literature data (54, 55).

Depressive symptoms are prevalent in ALS; however, worsening depression was not observed in our sample during follow-ups, as previously recorded (56, 57). In contrast, no clinically relevant anxiety levels were found at serial investigations, in accordance to previous results (58-60).

Longitudinal cognitive-behavioural performance and genetic profile

Despite recent literature having confirmed the high prevalence of cognitive-behavioural impairment in patients with *C9orf72* repeat expansions (39, 30, 61), only a small proportion of our mutated ALS patients showed such alterations. However, our data could possibly be explained by the small number of mutation carriers who completed the follow-up evaluations in our sample cohort.

More generally, the high drop-out rate of patients during the serial follow-up and the resulting small sample size, also with regard to genetic data, represent a limitation of our study,

1 together with a bias towards slow progressors and long survivors, thus suggesting the need to
2 enlarge these cohorts in future analyses.

4 **Conclusion**

5 In summary, our results support the use of the ECAS also in moderate and advanced stages of
6 the disease, in order to assess cognitive-behavioural progression in ALS. Our ALS Italian
7 population showed no significant cognitive deterioration at ECAS performance between serial
8 evaluations; on the contrary, we detected a significant improvement between baseline and 12-
9 months assessment at some ECAS scores. No increase of behavioural changes over time was
10 recorded at the ECAS Behaviour Interview even if such changes were detected when
11 measured by FBI, thus suggesting a possible progression of behavioural features in ALS.
12 Moreover, behaviour impairment emerged as a prominent issue characterising our drop-outs,
13 further underlining its critical role in clinical management of ALS patients. Despite the above
14 mentioned limitations, the present work represents the first Italian follow-up study performed
15 with the new gold standard for cognitive/behavioural screen in ALS. Accommodating for
16 verbal-motor components represents a crucial issue for ALS longitudinal assessment. The
17 implementation of Italian ECAS alternate forms represents a future challenge, in order to
18 minimize the presence of possible unfamiliarity/practice effect bias and will help to better
19 describe ALS patients' phenotypes along the course of the disease.

21 **Aknowledgments**

22 The Authors would like to thank patients and their relatives, who participated to this research.
23 The Authors received no formal funding for the present study. This study was supported by
24 the Italian Ministry of Health for BP, LC, AF and AL.

Disclosure of interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

References

1. Strong MJ, Grace GM, Freedman M, Lomen-Hoerth C, Woolley S, Goldstein LH et al. Consensus criteria for the diagnosis of frontotemporal cognitive and behavioural syndromes in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler* 2009; 10:131-146.
2. Lillo P, Hodges JR. Frontotemporal dementia and motor neurone disease: overlapping clinic-pathological disorders. *J Clin Neurosci* 2009;16(9):1131-5. doi: 10.1016/j.jocn.2009.03.005.
3. Woolley SC, York MK, Moore DH, Strutt AM, Murphy J, Schulz PE, Katz JS. Detecting frontotemporal dysfunction in ALS: utility of the ALS Cognitive Behavioral Screen (ALS-CBS). *Amyotroph Lateral Scler* 2010;11:303-311. doi: 10.3109/17482961003727954.
4. Flaherty-Craig C, Brothers A, Dearman B, Eslinger P, Simmons Z. Penn State screen exam for the detection of frontal and temporal dysfunction syndromes: application to ALS. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler* 2009;10:107-112. doi: 10.1080/17482960802378980.
5. Floris G, Borghero G, Chio A, Secchi L, Cannas A, Sardu C, et al. Cognitive screening in patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis in early stages. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler* 2012;13:95–101. doi: 10.3109/17482968.2011.605453.
6. Osborne RA, Sekhon R, Johnston W, Kalra S. Screening for frontal lobe and general cognitive impairment in patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *J Neurol Sci* 2014;336:191-196. doi: 10.1016/j.jns.2013.10.038.

- 1 7. Leslie FV, Hsieh S, Caga J, Savage SA, Mioshi E, Hornberger M, et al. Semantic deficits
2 in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener*
3 2015;16:46–53. doi: 10.3109/21678421.2014.987301.
- 4 8. Murphy J, Ahmed F, Lomen-Hoerth C. The UCSF screening exam effectively screens
5 cognitive and behavioral impairment in patients with ALS. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler*
6 *Frontotemporal Degener* 2015;16:24–30. doi: 10.3109/21678421.2014.960873.
- 7 9. Flaherty-Craig C, Eslinger P, Stephens B, Simmons Z. A rapid screening battery to
8 identify frontal dysfunction in patients with ALS. *Neurology* 2016;67:2070–2. doi:
9 10.1212/01.wnl.0000247667.89251.43.
- 10 10. Abrahams S, Leigh PN, Harvey A, Vythelingum GN, Grise D, Goldstein LH. Verbal
11 fluency and executive dysfunction in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis [ALS].
12 *Neuropsychologia* 2000;38:734–47.
- 13 11. Gordon PH, Wang Y, Doorish C, Lewis M, Battista V, Mitsumoto H, et al. A screening
14 assessment of cognitive impairment in patients with ALS. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler*
15 2007;8:362–5. doi: 10.1080/17482960701500817.
- 16 12. Tremolizzo L, Ferrarese C, Appollonio I. Exploring limits of neuropsychological
17 screening in ALS: the FAB problem. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener*
18 2013;14:157–8. doi: 10.3109/21678421.2012.746990.
- 19 13. Raaphorst J, Beeldman E, Schmand B, Van Den Berg LH, De Visser M, De Haan RJ.
20 Response to ‘Exploring limits of neuropsychological screening in ALS: the FAB
21 problem’. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2013;14:159–60. doi:
22 10.3109/21678421.2012.747541.
- 23 14. Abrahams S, Newton J, Niven E, Foley J, Bak T. Screening for cognition and behaviour
24 changes in ALS. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2014;15:9–14. doi:
25 10.3109/21678421.2013.805784.

- 1 15. Poletti B, Solca F, Carelli L, Madotto F, Lafronza A, Faini A, et al. The validation of the
2 Italian Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural ALS Screen (ECAS). *Amyotroph Lateral*
3 *Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2016;17:489–98. doi: 10.1080/21678421.2016.1183679.
- 4 16. Lulé D, Burkhardt C, Abdulla S, Böhm S, Kollewe K, Uttner I, et al. The Edinburgh
5 Cognitive and Behavioural Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Screen: a cross-sectional
6 comparison of established screening tools in a German-Swiss population. *Amyotroph*
7 *Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2015;16:16-23. doi:
8 10.3109/21678421.2014.959451.
- 9 17. Ye S, Ji Y, Li C, He J, Liu X, Fan D. The Edinburgh cognitive and behavioural ALS
10 screen in a chinese amyotrophic lateral sclerosis population. *PLoS One*
11 2016;11:e0155496. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0155496.
- 12 18. Niven E, Newton J, Foley J, Colville S, Swingler R, Chandran S. Validation of the
13 Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Screen (ECAS): A
14 cognitive tool for motor disorders. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener*
15 2015;16:172-9. doi: 10.3109/21678421.2015.1030430.
- 16 19. Pinto-Grau M, Burke T, Lonergan K, McHugh C, Mays I, Madden C, et al. Screening for
17 cognitive dysfunction in ALS: validation of the Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural
18 ALS Screen (ECAS) using age and education adjusted normative data. *Amyotroph Lateral*
19 *Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2017;18(1-2):99-106. doi:
20 10.1080/21678421.2016.1249887.
- 21 20. Loose M, Burkhardt C, Aho-Ozhan H, Keller J, Abdulla S, Bohm S, et al. Age and
22 education-matched cut-off scores for the revised German/Swiss-German version of
23 ECAS. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2016;17:374–6. doi:
24 10.3109/21678421.2016.1162814.

21. Strong MJ, Grace GM, Orange JB, Leeper HA, Menon RS, Aere C. A prospective study of cognitive impairment in ALS. *Neurology* 1999;53:1665–70.
22. Gordon PH, Goetz RR, Rabkin JG, Dalton K, McElhiney M, Hays AP, et al. A prospective cohort study of neuropsychological test performance in ALS. *Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis* 2010;11(3):312-20. doi: 10.3109/17482961003622585.
23. Schreiber H, Gaigalat T, Wiedemuth-Catrinescu U, Graf M, Uttner I, Muche R, et al. Cognitive function in bulbar- and spinal-onset amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. A longitudinal study in 52 patients. *J Neurol* 2005;252:772–81. doi: 10.1007/s00415-005-0739-6.
24. Elamin M, Bede P, Byrne S, Jordan N, Gallagher L, Wynne B, et al. Cognitive changes predict functional decline in ALS: a population-based longitudinal study. *Neurology* 2013;80(17):1590-7. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0b013e31828f18ac.
25. Abrahams S, Leigh PN, Goldstein LH. Cognitive change in ALS: a prospective study. *Neurology* 2005;64:1222–6. doi: 10.1212/01.WNL.0000156519.41681.27.
26. Kilani M, Micallef J, Soubrouillard C, Rey-Lardiller D, Demattei C, Dib M, et al. A longitudinal study of the evolution of cognitive function and affective state in patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Other Motor Neuron Disord* 2004;5(1):46-54. doi: 10.1080/14660820310017560.
27. Robinson KM, Lacey SC, Grugan P, Glosser G, Grossman M, McCluskey LF. Cognitive functioning in sporadic amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: a six month longitudinal study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2006;77:668–70. doi: 10.1136/jnnp.2005.073403.
28. Kasper E, Zydatiss K, Schuster C, Machts J, Bittner D, Kaufmann J, et al. No change in executive performance in ALS patients: a longitudinal neuropsychological study. *Neurodegener Dis* 2016;16:184–91. doi: 10.1159/000440957.

29. Moretti R, Torre P, Antonello RM, Carraro N, Cazzato G, Bava A. Complex cognitive disruption in motor neuron disease. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord* 2002;14:141–50. doi: 63600.
30. Byrne S, Elamin M, Bede P, Shatunov A, Walsh C, Corr B, et al. Cognitive and clinical characteristics of patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis carrying a C9orf72 repeat expansion: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet Neurol* 2012;11:232–40. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(12)70014-5.
31. De Silva D, Hsieh S, Caga J, Leslie FV, Kiernan MC, Hodges JR, et al. Motor function and behaviour across the ALS-FTD spectrum. *Acta Neurol Scand* 2016;133:367–72. doi: 10.1111/ane.12471.
32. Mioshi E, Hsieh S, Caga J, Ramsey E, Chen K, Lillo P, et al. A novel tool to detect behavioural symptoms in ALS. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2014;15:298–304. doi: 10.3109/21678421.2014.896927.
33. Burkhardt C, Neuwirth C, Weber M. Longitudinal assessment of the Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Screen (ECAS): lack of practice effect in ALS patients? *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2017;18(3-4):202-209. doi: 10.1080/21678421.2017.1283418.
34. Montuschi A, Iazzolino B, Calvo A, Moglia C, Lopiano L, Restagno G, et al. Cognitive correlates in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: a population-based study in Italy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015;86(2):168-73. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2013-307223.
35. Olney RK, Murphy J, Forshew D, Garwood E, Miller BL, Langmore S, et al. The effects of executive and behavioral dysfunction on the course of ALS. *Neurology* 2005;65(11):1774-7. doi: 10.1212/01.wnl.0000188759.87240.8b.

- 1 36. Elamin M, Phukan J, Bede P, Jordan N, Byrne S, Pender N, et al. Executive dysfunction is
2 a negative prognostic indicator in patients with ALS without dementia. *Neurology*
3 2011;76(14):1263-9. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0b013e318214359f.
- 4 37. Brooks BR, Miller RG, Swash M, Munsat TL & World Federation of neurology Research
5 Group on Motor Neuron Disease. El Escorial revisited: revised criteria for the diagnosis of
6 amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Other Motor Neuron Disord*
7 2000;1(5):293-9.
- 8 38. Cedarbaum JS, Stambler N, Malta E, Fuller C, Hilt D, Thurmond B, et al. The ALSFRS-
9 R: a revised ALS functional rating scale that incorporates assessment of respiratory
10 function. *J Neurol Sci* 1999;169:13-21.
- 11 39. Ratti A, Corrado L, Castellotti B, Del Bo R, Fogh I, Cereda C, et al. C9orf72 repeat
12 expansion in a large Italian ALS cohort: evidence of a founder effect. *Neurobiol Aging*
13 2012;33(10):2528.e7-14. doi: 10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2012.06.008.
- 14 40. Rohrer JD, Isaacs AM, Mizielinska S, Mead S, Lashley T, Wray S et al. C9orf72
15 expansions in frontotemporal dementia and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Lancet Neurol*
16 2015;14:291-301. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(14)70233-9.
- 17 41. Dubois B, Slachevsky A, Litvan I, Pillon B. The FAB. A frontal assessment battery at
18 bedside. *Neurology* 2000;55:1621-1626.
- 19 42. Pirani A, Nasreddine ZS, Tulipani C, Neri M. Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MOCA):
20 uno strumento rapido per lo screening del Mild Cognitive Impairment. Dati preliminari
21 della versione italiana. Atti IV Congresso Regionale Associazione Italiana Psicogeriatria.
22 Bologna, 2007.
- 23 43. Alberici A, Geroldi C, Cotelli M, et al. The Frontal Behavioural Inventory (Italian
24 version) differentiates frontotemporal lobar degeneration variants from Alzheimer's
25 disease. *Neurol Sci* 2007;28:80–86. doi: 10.1007/s10072-007-0791-3.

- 1 44. Beck AT, Ward CH, Mendelson M, Mock J, Erbaugh J. An inventory for measuring
2 depression. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1961;4:561-71.
- 3 45. Spielberger, C.D., Gorsuch, R.L., and Lushene, R. (2007). The State Trait Anxiety
4 Inventory (STAI). Test Manual for Form X. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist Press
5 (trad. Italiana a cura di Lazzari R. E Pancheri P., "S.T.A.I. Questionario di
6 autovalutazione dell'ansia di stato e di tratto". Organizzazioni Speciali, Firenze,1980).
- 7 46. Strong MJ, Abrahams S, Goldstein LH, Woolley S, Mclaughlin P, Snowden J et al.
8 Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis - frontotemporal spectrum disorder (ALS-FTSD): Revised
9 diagnostic criteria. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2017;5:1-22. doi:
10 10.1080/21678421.2016.1267768.
- 11 47. Raaphorst J, Beeldman E, Jaeger B, Schmand B, van den Berg LH, Weikamp JG, et al. Is
12 the Frontal Assessment Battery reliable in ALS patients? *Amyotroph Lateral Scler*
13 *Frontotemporal Degener* 2013;14(1):73-4. doi: 10.3109/17482968.2012.712974.
- 14 48. Bartels C, Wegrzyn M, Wiedl A, Ackermann V, Ehrenreich H. Practice effects in healthy
15 adults: a longitudinal study on frequent repetitive cognitive testing. *BMC Neurosci*
16 2010;11:118. doi: 10.1186/1471-2202-11-118.
- 17 49. Hausknecht JP, Halpert JA, Di Paolo NT, Moriarty Gerrard MO. Retesting in selection: a
18 meta-analysis of coaching and practice effects for tests of cognitive ability. *J Appl*
19 *Psychol* 2007;92(2):373-85. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.373.
- 20 50. Crockford CJ, Kleynhans M, Wilton E, Radakovic R, Newton J, Niven EH, et al. ECAS
21 A-B-C: alternate forms of the Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural ALS Screen.
22 *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2017;5:1-8. doi:
23 10.1080/21678421.2017.1407793.
- 24 51. Crockford C, Newton J, Lonergan K, Madden C, Mays I, O'Sullivan M, et al. Measuring
25 reliable change in cognition using the Edinburgh Cognitive and Behavioural ALS Screen

(ECAS). *Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener* 2017;7:1-9. doi: 10.1080/21678421.2017.1407794.

52. Woolley SC, Zhang Y, Schuff N, Weiner MW, Katz JS. Neuroanatomical correlates of apathy in ALS using 4 Tesla diffusion tensor MRI. *Amyotroph Lateral Scler* 2011;12:52–8.

53. Radakovic R, Stephenson L, Colville S, Swinger R, Chandran S, Abrahams S. Multidimensional apathy in ALS: validation of the Dimensional Apathy Scale. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2016;87(6):663-9. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2015-310772.

54. Grace GM, Orange JB, Rowe A, Findlater K, Freedman M, Strong MJ. Neuropsychological functioning in PLS: a comparison with ALS. *Can J Neurol Sci* 2011;38(1):88-97.

55. Ringholz GM, Appel SH, Bradshaw M, Cooke NA, Mosnik DM, Schulz PE. Prevalence and patterns of cognitive impairment in sporadic ALS. *Neurology* 2005;65(4):586-90. doi: 10.1212/01.wnl.0000172911.39167.b6.

56. Thakore NJ, Pioro EP. Depression in ALS in a large self-reporting cohort. *Neurology* 2016;86(11):1031-8. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000002465.

57. Matuz T, Birbaumer N, Hautzinger M, Kübler A. Psychosocial adjustment to ALS: a longitudinal study. *Front Psychol* 2015;6:1197. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01197.

58. Beeldman E, Raaphorst J, Klein Twennaar M, de Visser M, Schmand BA, de Haan RJ. The cognitive profile of ALS: a systematic review and meta-analysis update. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2016;87(6):611-9. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2015-310734.

59. Goldstein LH, Atkins L, Landau S, Brown RG, Leigh PN. Longitudinal predictors of psychological distress and self-esteem in people with ALS. *Neurology* 2006;67(9):1652-8. doi: 10.1212/01.wnl.0000242886.91786.47.

60. Kurt A, Nijboer F, Matuz T, Kübler A. Depression and anxiety in individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: epidemiology and management. *CNS Drugs* 2007;21(4):279-91.

61. Boeve BF, Boylan KB, Graff-Radford NR, DeJesus-Hernandez M, Knopman DS, Pedraza O, et al. Characterization of frontotemporal dementia and/or amyotrophic lateral sclerosis associated with the GGGGCC repeat expansion in C9orf72. *Brain* 2012;135:765–83. doi: 10.1093/brain/aws004.

Supplementary material available online

Supplementary Tables 1-2

Tables and Figure Captions

Table 1. Longitudinal performance on the ECAS subdomains and Total score, FAB and MoCA of the 48 ALS patients who completed the ECAS at T0 and T1. Data are expressed as means (standard deviations).

Table 2. Longitudinal performance on the ECAS subdomains and Total score, of the ALS patients subgroup (n=18) who completed the three assessments. Data are expressed as means (standard deviations).

Table 3. Correlations between ECAS Carer Interview (number of symptoms and total score) and FBI at T₀, T₁ and T₂.

Table 4. Correlations between ECAS Carer Interview (number of symptoms and total score) and FBI and cognitive performance at the ECAS at T₀, T₁ and T₂.

Figure 1. Flowchart and basic demographic characteristics of the ALS cohort

Figure 2. Distribution of behavioural changes in ALS patients across each follow-up

Supplementary Table 1. Mean performance of ALS patients at T₀, T₁ and T₂ on the ECAS subdomains and Total score, FAB and MoCA. Number of patients cognitively and/or behaviourally impaired are also reported

Supplementary Table 2. Number of dropped out patients who were classified as cognitively and/or behaviourally impaired at the last evaluation performed

Tables

Table 1. Longitudinal performance on the ECAS subdomains and Total score, FAB and MoCA of the 48 ALS patients who completed the ECAS at T₀ and T₁. Data are expressed as means (standard deviations).

	Baseline (T ₀) N=48	6 months (T ₁) N = 48	<i>t-test</i> <i>p-value</i>
Executive functions	34.25 (6.25)	34.29 (7.60)	<i>0.952</i>
Language functions	23.54 (3.68)	24.02 (3.36)	<i>0.143</i>
Fluency	17.13 (4.95)	16.92 (5.47)	<i>0.711</i>
Memory functions	14.60 (4.60)	15.42 (4.50)	<i>0.059</i>
Visuospatial functions	11.38 (0.89)	11.40 (1.30)	<i>0.921</i>
ALS-Specific Functions	74.92 (11.79)	75.23 (13.12)	<i>0.753</i>
ALS Non-specific Functions	25.98 (4.75)	26.81 (5.04)	<i>0.053</i>
ECAS Total Score	100.90 (15.11)	102.04 (17.07)	<i>0.286</i>
FAB	15.93 (1.51)	16.13 (1.45)	<i>0.589</i>
MoCA	24.35 (3.09)	24.15 (3.55)	<i>>0.999</i>

Bold numbers indicate statistical significance with $p < 0.05$. FAB: Frontal Assessment Battery; MoCA: Montreal Cognitive Assessment.

Table 2. Longitudinal performance on the ECAS subdomains and Total score, of the ALS patients subgroup (n=18) who completed the three assessments. Data are expressed as means (standard deviations).

	Baseline (T ₀) N=18	6 months (T ₁) N=18	12 months (T ₂) N=18	<i>ANOVA</i> <i>p-value</i>
--	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------

Executive functions	36.17 (5.35)	34.61 (8.98)	37.83 (4.55)	<i>0.230</i>
Language functions	23.78 (3.84)	23.72 (3.44)	24.33 (3.50)	<i>0.505</i>
Fluency	17.67 (5.46)	17.89 (5.29)	17.00 (5.58)	<i>0.423</i>
Memory functions	13.72 (5.07)	14.39 (5.50)*	16.39 (4.68)*	0.011
Visuospatial functions	11.28 (0.89)	11.17 (1.72)	11.50 (0.86)	<i>0.289</i>
ALS-Specific Functions	77.83 (12.24)	76.06 (14.55)	79.17 (11.43)	<i>0.125</i>
ALS Non-specific Functions	25.00 (5.18)	25.56 (6.32)	27.89 (4.71)*, §	0.003
ECAS Total Score	102.83 (16.42)	101.61 (20.12)	107.06 (15.76)*, §	0.023

Bold numbers indicate statistical significance with $p < 0.05$. * $p < 0.05$ vs T₀; § $p < 0.05$ vs T₁

Table 3. Correlations between ECAS Carer Interview (number of symptoms and total score) and FBI at T₀, T₁ and T₂.

		T ₀			T ₁			T ₂		
		FBI-A	FBI-B	FBI-TOT	FBI-A	FBI-B	FBI-TOT	FBI-A	FBI-B	FBI-TOT
ECAS Behaviour Interview – Symptoms	r	0.68	0.52	0.71	0.71	0.74	0.81	0.74	0.78	0.85
	<i>p-value</i>	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.002	<0.001	<0.001
ECAS Behaviour Interview – Total Score	r	0.68	0.60	0.75	0.72	0.76	0.82	0.69	0.89	0.87
	<i>p-value</i>	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.004	<0.001	<0.001

Bold numbers indicate statistical significance with $p < 0.05$. FBI: Frontal Behaviour Inventory.

1 Table 4. Correlations between ECAS Carer Interview (number of symptoms and total score) and FBI and cognitive performance at the ECAS at T₀, T₁ and T₂.

		T ₀					T ₁					T ₂				
		ECAS Behav Interview- Symptom	ECAS Behav Interview- Tot	FBI-A	FBI-B	FBI-Tot	ECAS Behav Interview- Symptom	ECAS Behav Interview- Tot	FBI-A	FBI-B	FBI-Tot	ECAS Behav Interview- Symptom	ECAS Behav Interview- Tot	FBI-A	FBI-B	FBI-Tot
ALS-Specific Functions	r	-0.09	-0.08	-0.11	-0.09	-0.12	-0.16	-0.16	-0.29	-0.12	-0.27	-0.57	-0.49	-0.72	-0.35	-0.63
	<i>p-value</i>	0.277	0.324	0.193	0.274	0.159	0.287	0.274	0.051	0.431	0.072	0.026	0.065	0.002	0.204	0.011
ALS Non-specific Functions	r	-0.11	-0.09	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07	-0.15	-0.18	-0.24	-0.17	-0.24	-0.54	-0.50	-0.61	-0.43	-0.60
	<i>p-value</i>	0.178	0.274	0.477	0.479	0.414	0.317	0.222	0.112	0.260	0.101	0.036	0.057	0.016	0.105	0.018
ECAS Total Score	r	-0.10	-0.09	-0.10	-0.09	-0.11	-0.17	-0.18	-0.29	-0.14	-0.28	-0.58	-0.51	-0.71	-0.38	-0.64
	<i>p-value</i>	0.217	0.278	0.214	0.284	0.176	0.263	0.228	0.047	0.347	0.060	0.024	0.055	0.003	0.158	0.009

2 Bold numbers indicate statistical significance with $p < 0.05$. ECAS Behav Interview – Symptom: ECAS Behaviour Interview – number of symptoms; ECAS Behav Interview – Tot: ECAS
3 Behaviour Interview – Total Score; FBI: Frontal Behaviour Inventory.

4